John Day Drawdown Phase I Study
Public Meeting Record
Umatilla, Oregon
February 23, 1999

Col. Robert Slusar: Lots of people still signing up. There are still a number of people that are signing in back there. We will let those people get signed in and then we will go ahead and get started, so in about the next couple of minutes here …

While we're waiting for these last couple of people to come in, I'd like to thank IRZ Consulting for providing our refreshments here tonight, so if you have an opportunity I think Fred is sitting over here, so if you have an opportunity, thank him for providing our drinks and our food here tonight. Thank you.

It looks like we have pretty much everybody … there's a couple of people coming in but I'll go ahead and get started because I know you've got … taken time out of your busy schedule to be here tonight to hear us, so I want to go ahead and move on.

I'm Colonel Bob Slusar. I am the Commander of Portland District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. My office is located in Portland, Oregon. If you are not familiar in how we break out the Corps districts, they're broken down by watershed. I have responsibility for the State of Oregon and Southern Washington, based upon watersheds. There are five districts in the Northwestern Division and we all report to a General Officer who is a Division Commander. He is also located in Portland, Oregon. The five districts under his control are Portland District, Seattle District, Walla Walla District, Kansas City and Omaha. The reason why I'm here tonight is because the operational control of John Day project is in Portland District. I have operational control for John Day, The Dalles, and Bonneville on the Columbia River. Walla Walla District, Lt. Col. Bulen, has responsibility and operational control of McNary and the lower Snake projects and Col. Rigsby has the responsibility for Chief Joe up in the Seattle District. So, it's kinda where we break boundary lines on projects.

I have a team here; the team leader is Stuart Stanger. He is the individual that's putting together the study so we can report back to Congress. They're here for three reasons: The first reason is to provide you the information on where we're at with this study, how we're going about this study, what information we're looking for, for this study, and Stuart will take a few minutes and talk about that project and that process when I turn the mike over to him. The second reason is to hear your comments. Again, this is a one-year study that we're doing, and we must report back to Congress to see if we go to Phase II. Phase II would be similar to what they're doing in

the Lower Snake Study, a feasibility study. The third reason is because there's a lot of information out there that we may not know about, and so we need your help. We need your help to join our study. We need help to find what nuggets are out there that we may have not found in terms of two items: costs, or benefits and impacts. We need to know what the impacts are and what the benefits are to complete this process and report back. So, those are two things we are trying to get from this process in meeting with you folks out here today. To do that we have two people here at the table that will walk us through the process. The first one is on my far right, your left, and that is Eric Ostrovsky. Eric is with the National Marine Fisheries Service. He'll talk about the fisheries issues as a result of the drawdown, where we're at and how we're getting to that portion of it on the fisheries side. He represents the federal biologist in the study. The federal engineer in the study and the project manager for the study is Stuart Stanger. He works for me, the Corps of Engineers, Portland District, and his team is over here. Again, we're looking at what the operational impacts are and some of the fishery impacts as we put together this study. So, what I'd like to do is turn the mike over to Stuart, let him walk you through where we're at in the process, and then we'll open it up after Eric's and Stuart's comments to questions and answers, and then any comments that we may have from you folks out here tonight.

Stuart Stanger: Good evening. I want to thank everyone myself -- thank you for coming out tonight. I know a lot of you came early and by the time we get out of here tonight you will have spent several hours here, talking about a very important issue. I want to tell you that the Corps of Engineers and National Marine Fisheries Service believes that the studies to look at John Day drawdown are necessary to expose, if you will, all the opportunities to recover salmon. The Corps of Engineers is not proposing to drawdown the John Day Dam, and you will hear more about what this study is, but it is not a proposal to draw down John Day Dam, but we do believe it's important to get all the information out so that all the decision makers can choose which approach we want to take to help recover the salmon.

We have met with several people in the past few months. Some of you are in the audience tonight. And we have heard that just the fact that we're doing a study has impacts on this region, that companies don't want to move into the area, that the lending policies are different, and we're sympathetic to that. We're sorry that happens but we're all here, as you know, to come up with a method for salmon recovery and again, we believe drawdown is one option that needs to be considered.

We are only doing a Phase I study, as the Colonel mentioned. We only have authority from Congress to do Phase I, and I'm going to explain to you what Phase I is in a few minutes, but we are not drawing down John Day Dam; we're not doing a test similar to what they did at Granite a few years ago. There have been some people who believe that is what we're talking about doing.

That is not what we're doing. We are going to talk about drawdown, a permanent drawdown. It would be year around and it would be indefinite. It would not be a test. We are going to look at the potential benefits and the costs, and I'll talk a little bit more about how we're going to do that, and as the Colonel mentioned, one of the reasons we're holding these public meetings is we're looking for information. I have been given some information already tonight. Some studies that have been done in the past. That's the kind of information we're looking for. We are trying to gather all existing information and the Corps of Engineers will evaluate that information, and we will make some judgment as to what we think is correct and what's not correct, and we will make a recommendation to Congress. Again, many of you came early and you met some of the team members. This is a part of the team that is helping me with this study. We will be around for a little while after this meeting, and if during this meeting you think of some specific questions you want to ask these individuals, please do so. I am going to introduce them. I'm going to start with Dawn Edwards. She is out of our Public Affairs Office. She is sitting here and is going to run the projector for us. She's responsible for setting these meetings up, and let me tell you, it's a big job. Then we have Brian Shenk. He's the economist for the study. We have Ed Woodruff. He's looking specifically at the hydropower impacts. Ken Soderlind is looking at navigation. Art Fong is looking at water supply. John Todd is looking at irrigation and utilities. Our geologist is Chris Budai. Bob Willis is the Corps' fishery and wildlife biologist. Also, in the audience we have Dave Linehan. He's the Umatilla Wildlife Refuge Manager for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and out of Portland with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, we have Larry Rasmussen. Those individuals will be involved with the study as well, so at the end of this meeting, if you have any specific questions, certainly grab those people.

What we're gonna do now is we're gonna move into some quick presentations. I am going to ask that you hold your questions until I'm back up here again, and after I do my presentation. First, we're gonna have Eric Ostrovsky -- and what we're doing tonight -- this is not a formal testimony but we are recording the comments that are made, so we're gonna have some microphones passed around and we will ask you to speak into the microphone, because it is being recorded, and then those comments will be transcribed and will be included in the report that we submit to Congress, so it will just make things flow much smoother if you can wait until Eric and I are done, and we will open it up for questions, and we have some people available to pass the microphones around. With that, I'm gonna turn it over to Eric ---If somebody could catch the lights.

Eric Ostrovsky: Sure, well thank you. I'm not sure if -- I assume it was mentioned. We have been to a number of meetings throughout the Pacific Northwest. Again, my name is Eric Ostrovsky. I'm from the Portland office of the National Marine Fisheries Service. One of the things, you know, we've been to all these meetings. We've met with some fishers up in Alaska, people in Montana and Idaho, but outside of Alaska, basically, the main feeling about people is

that they're living here and there's something unique about the Pacific Northwest. Most people want to live here, and I think what most people would agree to, is one of the things that makes the Northwest unique is salmon and steelhead - - what's in our rivers. Unfortunately, one of the major problems is there has been a dramatic decrease in salmon runs throughout the Pacific Northwest, actually throughout the whole West Coast. Some estimates have historic runs in the Columbia Basin between anywhere from 10 to 16 million salmon and steelhead a year. There has just been a dramatic decline in that. A lot of that loss, especially here in the Columbia Basin, has been due to habitat loss from dam construction; Grand Coulee Dam and Hell's Canyon Complex are good examples of dams that were built where they just block passage behind them, and while the significant habitat has been lost by that, but building dams have also caused issues as far as passage, and especially talking to all of you tonight, as you all know, there are other reasons for the decline in salmon. People here have mentioned problems with the fisheries, hatchery policies, and how that's affected it, and also other habitat impacts. Whether that's through timber or just population growth in the region, in areas like Portland. It has all had an impact on salmon, as we have been going.

Basically, in 1991, the first salmon up in the Columbia Basin were listed. It was the Columbia River Sockeye salmon. Soon thereafter, in 1992, Snake River spring, summer and fall Chinook were listed. In 1998 steelhead were listed, both in the Columbia River and in the Snake River. I didn't mention it here because it is not behind John Day, but also in the Willamette, and there are two more proposed listings which will be determinations very soon. These are fish that would migrate beyond John Day Dam.

What I want to show, when you look at the whole Columbia River Basin, since 1991 there's actually, I believe it's 13 stocks, that have either been listed or proposed to listing, and as I mentioned, there are a lot of things that are impacting the fish and what's going on. As a matter of fact, I could have done just a slide that would have shown the whole West Coast, and you would see that unfortunately, a checkerboard going all the way down to California with fish that are either listed, proposed for listing, but I thought I would show this as it would at least show what is going on in the Columbia Basin, and what I'd like to show is that the issue went beyond just the Snake River salmon. In 1995, after the salmon were listed, NMF consults on federal activities, in this case with the Corps and the other action agencies on the Federal Columbia River Power System, to make sure that their operations were not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of those salmon, but remember, since then there have been --there's been some other listings, too. What NMFS came up at that time was a reasonable, prudent alternative to make sure that the operations would not jeopardize the species. In that, there were a number of measures, and the objective was to implement all the reasonable and prudent alternative measures. Some people think that all we do is study, and it's been called at other meetings,

Analysis to Paralysis, or some other things, but it's actually more complicated than that. We have put in a lot of immediate improvements to the systems to help salmon right now. We've made a lot of -- there's a lot of studying going on because of the uncertainties and there are a lot of uncertainties as to what's affecting the fish. We've made major structural modifications within the current system, but there are -- it was felt that status quo or the base case and the Corps determined that there was not enough -- that there would have to be some major decisions made in the longterm configuration of the system, and what we use as what's called the phrase of adaptive management, because in any given year, because of the conditions or changes we might make, where there's a chance to tickle out some of those uncertainties as what's affecting the different stocks as they're going through, we try to identify and change that as we go.

In the next chart, I just tried to show some of the examples of the immediate improvements we have made within the system. These are primarily since 1995. We put in spring and summer flow objectives. Basically what that is, we are trying to operate the river during the migration season to get as much water as possible on juvenile migrants, especially in the summer to try to cool that water whenever possible to help. We have made a lot of improvements in the bypass system. This is primarily that they want to keep the juvenile migrants off of the turbines, the most destructive way for the fish to pass through the system, and through the bypasses, the migrants can go back in the river, or they can go into transportation systems. Another way to keep juvenile fish out of the turbines is just to have spill through the river and keep the fish going inriver, and that may -- and we have different spill regimes, and actually this year I know there's a lot of discussion about the spill regimes going on, and would be going on this year at John Day Dam, and at The Dalles. Another way we can help is -- a lot of fish are transported and the Biological Opinion calls for transportation of much of the fish, better means of transporting fish. Lately, we've been trying to transport more fish through barges, less through truck transportation, and we're doing that especially because the Independent Scientific Advisory Board said that is a better means of doing it. Trying to operate the turbines if you do have juvenile migrants going through that system, the least impact on them is if the turbines are working as efficiently as possible. Biological Opinion says that to operate those turbines up to 1% peak efficiency. I also want to mention that we're putting in fish -- the Corps is putting in fish friendlier turbines. There's one going in right now at Bonneville. There are several more on the way. I just wanted to mention those real quickly, especially. I probably don't have to to this audience, but tell the audiences what -- to let them know that there are things that we are doing immediately. We are making major modifications within the system. I mention the gas abatement program here and we're putting in lips that -- for spill at many of the dams. We put in spill deflectors at John Day. The idea is to limit as much as possible the total dissolved gas. I've put down extended length screens; that's a way in which you can get fish to go either through the bypass system so they can go into either transportation or back inriver. We have new monitoring facilities at many of the

projects, to help identify what's occurring at the project, for the different species that are listed, or through some of the experimentation that's going on. It gives us a better idea of what's happening under different conditions. A major modification was relocating the juvenile bypass system at Bonneville Dam. The idea there is when the fish do come out of the bypass system, to make sure they're not in an area where there's not much of a flow, and would have a lot of predators like northern pikeminnow, also called squawfish. Instead, the bypass system is putting them into the area where there is a much higher flow and less of a chance of predation. But again, all these are just illustrative of some of the major modifications that have been put into it. Information that we have been and we continue to look at is the inriver survival of fish as they're going through the system. We also compare that to transporting fish between the different stocks. You know, every year is different, depending on flow regimen, involuntary spill, and what we're doing, you're gonna have different numbers of fish that are gonna go inriver and be transported, and you know, what's occurring when you look at all of that together? Also, you can add some of the effects that are going on with the new technologies, some of them that I mentioned before, and it will give us an idea of what's the survival under the current system, and under changes within the system. One of the other things that the Biological Opinion asked us to look at is drawdown of the dams -- to do a study on that. You are all probably aware of the study that's going on on the Lower Snake River, and especially in the 1998 Steelhead Supplemental Opinion, we ask for a look at the drawdown of John Day Dam, what Stuart was saying under those methods. Why drawdown? Well, one of the reasons is drawdown does well -- faster water velocities in a given flow and that does relate to fish travel time, and at least for fall Chinook, faster travel time tends to promote juvenile survival. There are some other benefits, not just mainstem travel time. A drawdown of the pool would provide for rearing habitat, and the Independent Scientific Group, which is now called the Independent Scientific Advisory Board, and that advises both NMFS and the Northwest Power Planning Council, said in their report, "Return to the River," it's one of the things that you should look at. In the areas for upriver Brights which you have fish that are doing quite well, rearing primarily in more normative conditions that you could get through drawing down pools, such as John Day Dam. So, they said that's one of the things that we should take a look at ... It also could provide other benefits, and one of them would be more rearing habitat, and some of the studies have said that one time -- it has been estimated that 30,000 fish have reared in the pool at John Day Dam, so that's another benefit. I do want to mention, on the rearing habitat that that would be for upriver Bright fish and not listed fish, so it would be a benefit for salmon, but not those listed under the Endangered Species Act. Excuse me, that was for the spawning habitat, if we could -- no, that's okay. Finally, I just wanted to mention one thing beyond here. Some people are saying, well, so if you drew down John Day Dam, would that bring back the salmon? And I think that's a good question. Actually, when you look at it, you can't look at it from just the project basis. Many of the fish, the Snake River fish have eight dams to go through in this system. Some of the steelhead

on the Columbia River have nine dams, not all of them federal, so, you know, you would really be looking at a number of things going on at any one time. You probably would be looking at 4 H's and a group of things, of what you could do for fish. In this case, if you're looking at primarily mainstem passage, you're really looking at a cumulative impact of doing a lot of this together, but, you know, as I want to say, if basically that's all -- all of that would be involved in basically what this study was intended to do. Stuart ---

Stuart Stanger: It takes just a minute to change files here. I don't need to tell any of you that that is John Day Lock and Dam. What I'm going to talk about here real quickly, and it takes me about 10 minutes to get through this. I'll move through a lot of it much quicker for this audience because you folks live very near the project and know probably a lot more about it than I do. We're going to describe what the project provides. What does John Day Dam do now, and then you just need to realize that all of that is at risk. I'm going to describe to you what we are doing in the study, what the purpose of the study is, and talk to you real quickly about the schedule, and then how you can best become involved. Again, I don't think I need to tell you folks where John Day Dam is, so you can move on, Dawn --

Again, this is John Day Dam. Currently, the way that we would draw John Day Dam down is to remove that spillway, navigation lock, and probably a portion of the north embankment there in order to pass the flows. John Day Dam is one of two dams on the Columbia that provide flood control. John Day Dam provides 500,000 acre feet of flood control storage. That's one foot of water on 500,000 acres. It provides 2200 megawatts of power, about 9 million tons of cargo go through the navigation lock annually, and there are 14 recreation sites along the John Day pool. Our, I should say, my senior technical lead person, Chris Ferguson, was unable to be here tonight. She would normally be back there to answer questions on recreation. She did say, if any of you have specific questions, we have a sign-up sheet back there and I would ask you to just leave your name and number, and she'll contact you as soon as she is able, and will either meet with you or answer your questions over the phone.

There are 29 irrigation pump stations along the John Day Pool. Several people use water out of the John Day pool for municipal and industrial uses. Both Irrigon and Umatilla hatcheries use water out of the aquifer; so does the city of Boardman. That is all at risk. The Umatilla Wildlife Refuge is at risk. There are approximately 35,000 acres of land and water managed for wildlife along the John Day pool. The fish passage facilities that currently exist at John Day -- that's the ladders for the adults and the downstream passage facilities -- they would all need to be modified. Okay - so Phase I is all we're doing. What is Phase I going to do for us? It's gonna answer this question, I hope. Is it appropriate to continue further studies of John Day Dam? That's the big question that Phase I is intended to answer. Phase I is not intended to answer, should we draw

down? It's a question of whether or not we even need to do feasibility studies similar to what they're doing on the Snake River. We know that that study, if we do Phase II, would take four to five years to complete and would cost approximately $20 million, so the Corps of Engineers proposed that we do this in two phases because, as you know, several years ago we were looking at a drawdown to minimum operating pool, commonly called MOP. We looked at that and developed a lot of information as part of that study. We felt like that information, added with a little bit more that we are going to obtain through this study, we could maybe make a recommendation to Congress about whether further studies are necessary. If Phase II is authorized by Congress we will develop a scope and that will be a public developed scope. We would need to comply with NEPA. That requires public scoping meetings, so you can all come back and we will have another meeting and talk about what Phase II should look at. But, Phase I -- this is very important, Phase I is only trying to decide whether drawdown is something that needs to be considered further. If a Phase II study were done, it would look at drawdown, versus transportation, versus surface bypass, versus some of the other things that Eric mentioned that are being done on the river. It's drawdown versus other things, if you will. Phase I is just trying to look at whether drawdown is a viable option that's even worth considering. Okay, in Phase I the alternatives we're looking at are natural river and spillway crest, and I'm going to explain that. Dawn, if you'll go to the next slide. We're looking at both of those levels with and without flood control. If I can find my pointer. Maybe some of you picked up this diagram. We normally operate at elevation 265 right now, and we can draw down to elevation 257 in preparation for a flood to come down river, so we can store water from elevation 257; we can actually go up to 268 and we can store water, and then release it slowly to downstream so that we prevent flooding downstream. Spillway crest is one elevation we're looking at. The actual spillway crest is at elevation 210, and we anticipate we would have approximately 5 feet of head over the top of that under normal operation. If we were to provide flood control we would lower the spillway gates, store water about 30 to 40 feet, and that would provide flood control. Without flood control we just open the gates and let the water go, and whatever comes into the John Day pool goes downstream. And natural river normally would operate at 165 and without flood control, whatever came down would flow through the dam, through that removed spillway section. If we are to provide flood control at natural river we would basically have to reconstruct the spillway that is now at elevation 215; we would have to reconstruct it down here so that we could stop the flood water as it came down. So, there are really four alternatives that are being looked at in this Phase I study; the spillway crest with and without flood control, or natural river, with and without flood control, and we will develop four cost estimates.

The purpose of the study that we proposed to Congress was to evaluate the impacts to fish and wildlife. We said we would evaluate social and economic impacts and finally, we would provide a recommendation to Congress, and Congress agreed with us, that that's what we should do. So,

how are we going to look at the fisheries and wildlife impacts? When we were looking at drawdown to minimum operating pool, we began several biological studies, and then Congress stopped that study, and stopped all action to draw down to MOP, and so we stopped all the biological studies. We are going to re-initiate those; in fact, a number of them have already been re-initiated. We're going to finish those and we will have that data available. I'm sure a lot of you have heard about PATH, a Plan for Analyzing and Testing Hypotheses. We will be using that same process they're using on the Snake River. We will have some runs made for the John Day drawdown. A new item that we proposed in this study, that we proposed to Congress, is the formation of a Planning Aid Team. You can join that Planning Aid Team and if you sign up, and there's a sign-up list back here. If you want to sign up and participate as a team member you will be provided all of the biological information that's gathered; you will be invited to attend meetings that are held, and you will be able to put your two cents worth, if you will, as to what you think that biological data tells us. You will be joined by the PATH members. Also, there's a Planning Aid Letter that's a normal part of a Corps study. It is provided to us by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. That's why we have representatives here. They put together this letter and send it to the Corps of Engineers, and they will tell us what they believe the fish and wildlife impacts are and what we might be able to mitigate for those impacts, so that will be provided for this Phase I study. How do we look at the social and economic impacts? We are going to look at the cost to replace all of those things that would be impacted, and in this community I'm going to pick the irrigation as an example. If I drawdown John Day pool to spillway crest, there are 29 irrigation pump stations that will not work. They won't have any water at their intakes, so what would it cost to make them work? We will look at alternatives of what we could do to replace that, and that would be the cost for replacing irrigation. We will do that for hydropower, for navigation, for flood control, for the 2000 private wells that could go dry. We will develop a cost estimate, so as indicated before, we will have four different cost estimates, one for each of the alternatives, so we will know of those four what the minimum cost would be to have a drawdown. We will do trade-off analysis. Continuing on with the irrigation example, if I picked an irrigation pump station, it may be a simple matter of constructing a new pump station down by the new river, and maybe that's how I replace the water for that farmer. Another option that we're considering is canals down each side of the John Day pool, so you basically have three rivers running down from McNary to John Day. You would have a canal on the Washington side, a canal on the Oregon side, and then you'd have the mainstem river which contained the fish flowing down the middle. So, we will look at what will it cost to dredge a canal down each side of the channel so that irrigation could be taken out of that canal. So, we'll compare that to what it will cost to replace the pump stations with new pump stations. Whichever one is the least cost, that would be the recommendation if that option were selected. We will consider employment effects, and quality of life. We have an unique opportunity in this study -- one of the comments we have received at several meetings is that the Corps of Engineers normally only looks at national impacts and that

we ignore regional impacts, and that's a true statement, that's normally what we do. We have an opportunity in this study that we can consider the regional impacts and that is some of the information that we have collected in a couple of the communities already. If you have done economic studies and you are willing to share those with us, that would be greatly appreciated. Just some other things that we will be considering -- I mentioned earlier the adult and juvenile fish passage facilities at John Day would need to be modified. At least the adult facilities at McNary would also need to be modified if I draw down John Day. The ladders would not be deep enough in the pool. There are approximately 37 utilities adjacent to or in the John Day pool that we would need to look at. There are some 360 cultural resource sites that were covered with the pool that will need to be examined and protected, recovered. Some measure will have to be taken. Water quality is a major concern, both temperature, turbidity, and contaminants. Hazardous and toxic waste sites, potential sites -- we will identify sites that we inundated with the pool where we maybe were not as sensitive to hazardous and toxic waste. Now we're more sensitive to that. We also know that the sediments that have been deposited behind the John Day pool contain contaminants and exposing those contaminants may not be a good thing to do.

Our schedule: We will have a draft complete in September of this year. We began last October - October '98. We will have a draft completed in September '99. We will send that out to anyone who signs up on this list tonight. You will get a copy of it. You will be able to review and comment on that report, and then we will look at your comments, make whatever changes are necessary to the report, and we will make a recommendation to Congress in December. We have had public meetings already in Alaska, in Helena, Montana, in Lewiston, Idaho, in Portland. We're here tonight and we will be in Pasco on Thursday. We've also received requests to hold a couple more and we probably will hold more. So, we are interested in what you have to say.

In summary, the Corps will only be making a recommendation to Congress regarding further study in December. We will not be recommending whether or not John Day be drawn down. Congress will make the final decision whether or not to do a Phase II study. Without additional authority and money, I won't do anything on John Day. Now, how do you get involved, again, the Planning Aid Team sign-up list should be at the table when you leave, if you want to participate, sign up on that. When you get the copy of the report in September, please provide your review comments to Col. Slusar. You can, at any time, send Col. Slusar letters and he brings them right over to my desk, and if you want to write letters to other agencies or congressionals, you should do that.

Again, what we're gonna do now is we are gonna open this up to public comments and questions, but before I do that I just want to make clear that we understand this is a very sensitive issue. These meetings can become very controversial. I am not here to convince you of anything. We

don't know what our recommendation will be. Hopefully, I will know more in September, but tonight I don't know what the recommendation will be; we're going to gather the facts. We're not timing any of your comments. You can get up and talk as long as you want, theoretically … everyone may go home. But we would just ask that you be courteous to your neighbors. You know, there's a room full of people here, and if everybody takes a couple of minutes to talk, we will be here a long time, and that's okay. We're prepared to stay here and answer your questions, but we just ask that you be courteous. I also want to point out -- this team -- we have asked them to keep their personal opinions out of the study, to look at the facts. They're doing a very good job at that. They'll answer your questions as best they can. If I can't answer them, I'll call on one of them, but we just ask everybody to be courteous of one another and with that we'll turn the lights on and open this up to questions. If when you get the mike, you would tell us who you are, and if you represent an organization, that would be greatly appreciated, then we can have that for the record. Let me see if there's anything else I need to mention. I think that's it. With that …

George Hash: I'm George Hash, Mayor, here at Umatilla, and I do want to welcome you and all of the rest of … I'm glad to see such a good turnout here, but I would like to ask a few questions and I've given these questions to Dawn Edwards and she has assured me that she will get me the answers back to them. The question that I would like to know is what studies have been made between the declining -- the decline of salmon in the Columbia River and in the other coastal streams in Oregon. Let me make just a brief comment on this. When I was a kid, and this was in the late 30's when we used to hunt up the Kilchis River and where we camped we had to wade the river to get over there, and the salmon would knock us down if you weren't very careful, wading across that swift stream. They're not there now, and there's not a dam on that river, never has been. Another question I would like to ask is what is the salmon catch in the ocean during the last 75 years, and what I'm talking about there is, what was the salmon catch, the total amount of salmon that was caught 75 years ago, and as far as I know it, at that time, when I was a kid, there was only one other country fishing it and that was Japan, and now, I don't know how many there are, probably a dozen or more, and what I'd like to know is the amount of fish that is taken out of that ocean that never get a chance to come back here. We send our smolt down but they don't come back, and so we blame the dams; I don't know. Another question, what studies have been made on the effect of the warming temperatures in the ocean, and I know we have been reading recently about some biological studies that have been made on that, and where the ocean waters warm up, it does not produce the food that is necessary for salmon to produce. Last question on my questions is what studies have been made on the salmon kill by sea lions, and seals, and predatory fish and birds. When I was a kid no fisherman ever left Waldport or Tillamook Bay or Coos Bay or any of those without a rifle on board. You know what that rifle was for? It was to kill seals and sea lions, and they kept them in check, and now, if you've seen

recently over television they are running over the docks down there in California. I believe that we're missing many of the relevant factors in the study of our salmon decline, and I think these ought to be taken into account before we destroy our economic … our economy up here in this part of the world. As far as Umatilla is concerned we've got a new well, a new Rainey well system. We've just got it down. It's being tested right now. We might as well plug it if they drop that dam because we won't get any water out of it. Our marina will be dry. All of you -- I think you saw a picture of our marina; I'm not just sure, but anyhow, it will be dry and along with that our recreation facilities for your fishing, and for your hunting, and all of the other things, in addition to the nesting sites that will be destroyed for our ducks and geese that come here in the summertime to nest. Waste water affluent that goes out into that river, if they drop that river, I'm not sure what it would do, but it may cost us a complete new system and we are just now putting in a $10 million system, it not -- that is being constructed starting this spring, for that project, and we will have been wasting that amount of money. Add to this the entire economy that is dependent upon irrigation in our area, and I think that most of you are here tonight because of that problem that you will face, along with our port transport system and this has been mentioned already, and there is already mention of the fact that many industries are not interested in locating here at the present time until after this is settled, and as a result of that we're going to have to live on the low price jobs that our farm economy gives us and if they take that dam away we won't even have that. And I sure want to thank you for my time.

Stuart Stanger: Thank you for the comment. Those questions are in my book and we will get answers to you. I know none of my team can answer those questions tonight, and neither can I. but all of your points are good and you are absolutely right about your Rainey well, your outfall and your port. They would all be impacted with a drawdown.

Kim Puzey: My name is Kim Puzey; I'm with the Port of Umatilla, and I've got a statement that I'd like to put into the record. It's long and uses big words, but what it says is this study is a waste of time and money and the second study would be even worse. Thank you.

(Clapping from audience).

Stuart Stanger: Yeah. Make sure I could -- I knew I could get an applause if I waited long enough.

(Laughter). Anyway, make sure we have a copy of that. I see he has given it to Dawn, thank you. Anyone else? Come on, I know there's lots of questions out there. It's just a microphone -- --

Gary Neal: My name is Gary Neal and I'm the General Manager of the Port of Morrow, and I appreciate the opportunity to make some comments tonight. The Port of Morrow along with the Port of Umatilla, the Port of Arlington, and the Oregon Economic Development Department did an economic impact study in this region in October of 1998, and it's tied primarily to the use of the river system and focusing substantially on the John Day reservoir because of the discussion about the potential drawdown considerations. There are some components in here I'd just like to touch on, but I've also -- I think I submitted this to your economic people to take a look at, but just for your information: economic contribution for farm production, food processing, irrigated agriculture and transportation components on the river system here, and this three-county area equals about $1.62 billion in value a year and creates about 16,850 jobs, 52% of the total employment of the tri-county area here, so we're talking about a big issue and this economy -- this is the lifeblood of this economy. I wanted to touch base on some of the transportation components. For example, we're talking about 1.8 million tons of commodities, which go up and down within the John Day pool, besides the transportation that comes through the system. As you know, if you eliminate the transportation on the John Day, you'll eliminate transportation on the total river system, but this is just the local component. We're talking about 54,000 plus loaded trucks going down the Interstate system, and that's just the one-way component, and equals an equivalent to a reduction of 9,621,000 truck miles and 256,329,000 ton miles of truck traffic. We're talking about the tri-port water-borne transportation activity saved an estimated $12.8 million in that year alone in Interstate highway maintenance costs, and so on. You talk about the environmental impacts for moving to different motor transportation: you're talking about 25,171,000 pounds of nitrous oxide, 1,509,000 pounds of hydrocarbons and 4,506,000 pounds of carbon monoxide that would be emitted if you moved that product by truck. That's just on the local part, not the total river system itself. Some of the other things that the study didn't do that is important is that it didn't address the recreational component of our economy, and it didn't address some of the hydropower components that the total system, as well as the local power supply requirements if you take another 1400 plus megawatts of power generation in the local area through the gas-fired turbines in the … reservoir, the coal fired plant -- all are dependent upon the Columbia River for their cooling water as well, and in the economic conditions that go along with those businesses. So, I guess, in a nutshell, I agree with my counterpart that just spoke prior to me, except for I took a little longer to say it. We oppose any further studies. We believe this would just be -- would just devastate the economy of this area. Thank you.

Stuart Stanger: Thanks, Gary -- we do have your study. We got that a couple of weeks ago and I appreciate that.

Gary Neal: Okay.

Frank Harkgnridon: Thank you very much. I'm Frank Harkgnridon, the Mayor of Hermiston. Last night at the City Council meeting the City Council passed resolution #1542. A resolution opposing the drawdown of the John Day pool and opposing breaching of the John Day Dam; whereas, the social and economic disruption posed by a drawdown of the John Day pool, or breaching the John Day Dam is totally unacceptable to local communities and the region as the impacts to power, navigation, flood control, and recreation are significant and unacceptable, and whereas, neither the drawdown study nor the proposed drawdown action is supported by local residents or elected officials living in the area; and whereas, the Northwest Congressional Delegation should stop all further funding for any drawdown or dam breaching studies as it is wrong and poor public policy for the John Day pool drawdown study to be funded; and whereas, the Oregon and Washington governors should aggressively oppose any further drawdown studies or proposed actions, and whereas, the credibility of the Corps of Engineers as resource managers is rapidly diminishing by bringing forward these totally impractical drawdown studies, and the Corps must stop further work on any drawdowns, and whereas, the Corps of Engineers is wasting salmon recovery money by conducting the John Day pool drawdown study and is simply becoming a part of the salmon recovery industry. It appears their interest lies in operation money, not sound resource management, and whereas, the John Day pool drawdown study is a major distraction away from pursuing real salmon recovery. Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Hermiston City Council unequivocally opposes any drawdown of the John Day Dam pool below current operating levels and oppose breaching of the John Day Dam; passed last night by the Hermiston City Council and approved by the Mayor.

One other comment -- I went back today in the Hermiston Herald office and in September 28, 1933, take a little road down the history of all this. Congress gave a study to build Bonneville Dam. You know the reasons why they built Bonneville Dam. All 66 years of these dams for navigation, recreation, power, and everything else, the economy, for the farms, and irrigation facilities are going to be flushed down the toilet if you don't quit talking about drawing down all these dams and breaching the dams. Thank you.

(Clapping from the audience)

Stuart Stanger: Let me just say, thank you, Mayor; hopefully we can get a copy of that resolution. Got it.

Steve Eldrige: My name is Steve Eldrige from Umatilla Electric. We've always welcomed the Corps into our community. In fact, a lot of the things that are here are due to the Corps and I hope it's as painful for the Corps to consider undoing the things that we've built, as it is to us. I

think that this study is not warranted for quite a number of reasons. The first question I have is -- is there anywhere in the world that naturally spawning salmon stocks haven't declined dramatically over historical levels, or at least had tremendous cycles? Is-- has there been anything recovered by the Endangered Species Act? And if so, what's the total number and the percent of listing … that the system itself that's being followed has not had enough success to warrant following it again? Talking about flushing things down the toilet is really appropriate because Portland dumps 2 to 5 billion gallons of raw sewage into the Willamette. I wouldn't think that would be too good for salmon. When we talk about faster travel time tends to improve survival rates, how much faster does this velocity carry the fish? We don't know. What's the present survival rate through the reservoir? We don't know that. In fact, Oregon Fish and Wildlife has fought for about 10 or 15 years any pit tag detectors at John Day Dam so that we would know what the survival rate is. If you look at returning adults over Bonneville Dam, it's basically the same number as was when the dam was built in 1938. Now, we hear the argument that, well at that time, 85% of the returning adults were wild, and now 85% are hatchery. The fact still remains that the numbers are about the same at Bonneville. What happens to them? Nobody either knows or says. The PATH process. The way it's used now it looks only at hydro impacts. Anybody that looks at this system can't believe that a river system that's supported millions of salmon when there were 50,000 human beings in the Northwest, is the same system as it is now with over 10 million souls in the Northwest, and all the urbanization, the change in habitat, and on and on and on, the dams can't be the limiting factor. So, the biggest problem with proceeding is that we don't know any of the base information to measure a benefit. We don't know what fish are doing now and we don't know what they will do as a result of that. I think a more -- a broader problem is we don't know what we want in the region. We don't know if we want hatchery fish or if we want wild fish. We don't know if we want sustainable runs or we want harvestable runs. We don't know if ocean harvest is a problem or if inriver harvest is a problem, and we're not willing to make the hard decisions and until a unified plan for the region is available, this is a total waste of effort, and will be done many times over until an overall plan is available, and one last comment -- if you do this silliness, and you put a pump in the floodplain, do you think it will work?

(Clapping from audience).

Stuart Stanger: Bob, do you want to talk to any of the studies that are going on now? Concerning survival?

Bob Willis: Sure. I did want to mention that we do have pit tag detectors now at John Day Dam so one of the things that we will be able to answer is what survival is through that river reach.

You made some very good comments. There are some things that we are going to be including in the study.

Steve Eldrige: One thing that puzzles me is that we will take this pit tag information on a year-to-year basis and accept it as valid. Yet, the pit tag detectors and the count of returning smolt for Snake River fish have determined over the last five-year period that returns are as good as they were before the development of the Snake River. Why isn't that put in our assumptions to drive these kinds of studies?

Stuart Stanger: Yeah. All I can comment on is that I've read probably the same stuff you have about the numbers that were reported a month or so ago about the returns, and that will be considered. One thing that I'm hearing -- I think the mayor mentioned and I've kinda picked it up out of what you're saying. There are more things impacting the fish than the dams. We know that, but the dams are one thing that does, and we won't have any of the answers to anything, including the dams if we don't do some of these studies. I would personally agree; we need to look at harvest and hatcheries and other things and you need to have a plan, but one of those elements is the hydropower that we have to look at. It's the dams, and the Corps of Engineers -- let me make sure -- I'm going to protect the Corps of Engineers here a little bit, if I can, is -- the Corps of Engineers doesn't do anything, nothing, unless Congress tells us to, and gives us the money to do it. The Corps of Engineers does not dream up any study, and say we want to do this study. That's coming out of the region. Congress decides whether or not we can do that study. Congress told us to scope a study. We did that a year ago, and then in October they told us to implement that study, so we kinda do what we're told, whether we personally agree with it or not, but that's just a little bit of defense of the Corps. The Corps is not proposing to take away your irrigation pumps or to draw down John Day Dam. Congress looks to the Corps to be the fact-finder, and to tell us the honest truth, as best we can. I could come to this meeting tonight and it's clear already that just as I would have suspected, most people here would be opposed to the drawdown, but when we went to Juneau we had just the opposite audience. So, there are facts to defend each argument, and the Corps -- these folks are tasked with sorting through all that information and using their best engineering judgment as to what the options tell them should be done. With that -- comments, questions.

Barry Beyeler: My name is Barry Beyeler and I'm with the City of Boardman, utilities and natural resources manager, and I'm here at the request of the Mayor of Boardman, Thomas Myers, and the Council to read this into the record. "The City of Boardman appreciates the opportunity to provide these comments to the Corps of Engineers, concerning the impacts of alterations to John Day operation. The City of Boardman made a rather courageous decision in 1974 to develop a water system that is dependent upon the Columbia River as source water, to

provide for the residents of the community, past, current and future. This decision was based upon the promise of the federal government, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the United States Congress that the John Day Dam pool elevation would not be lower than 257 feet above mean sea level. The system was designed to effectively work within the operational limitations set forth and has been the city's sole source of water for over 20 years now. The system has met or exceeded water quality criteria set forth by the United States Environmental Protection Agency to meet public health protection standards. This system now stands in a position of jeopardy that may threaten the long history of public health protection. This would be done by either creating difficulties in meeting the standards or preclusion of meeting those standards by eliminating the aquifer characteristics that are so vital to the quality of the water served to the citizens of this community. Through the discussions, debates, disagreements, and deliberations on how to save some salmonid stocks in the Columbia and Snake river basins, it has become apparent that environmental laws enacted to protect the very environment in duress have been willingly and knowingly violated. These violations have become routine at the request of fisheries' managers that have continued to set harvest rates for the intentional killing of the salmon that are struggling to survive. Each year since 1994, spill waivers have been obtained that allow for violation of the Clean Water Act, the nation's principal water quality law. Waivers for gas supersaturation levels of 120% have been granted annually by the states of Washington and Oregon since 1994. The Clean Water Act standard of 110% is known to cause problems for the fish that we are attempting to save. Additionally, the U.S. EPA dioxin TMDL is violated during the fall and winter months when the mean flows cannot be met to prevent dioxin concentrations from exceeding the TMDL set as a public health standard. Dioxins are known to cause mutations in the fish populations and are known bio-accumulators. In 1993 and 1994 the city performed microscopic particulate analysis samples of the city's water supply as directed, under the Safe Drinking Water Act, and found disturbing results concerning non-chlorophyll possessing micro-organisms, mostly associated with benthos (benthic) organisms which are lower food chain organisms. This data was brought forward and to date, still appears to be the only data of this type in the John Day pool. Why should the City of Boardman have the only credible data of this type although obtained for an entirely different purpose, the protection of public health, when these are basic food chain organisms that the salmonid populations are dependent upon? Proposals to remove dams on the lower Snake River present a scenario that should be of concern to all citizens and fisheries' managers. There are known deposits of radionucleides in the sediment column behind McNary Dam. Additionally, a strong case could be made that other contaminants are also entrapped in the sediment column. However, the projected 150 million cubic yards of sediment that will be transported into the McNary pool should the lower Snake River dams be removed, will require dredging and re-suspension of those sediments in that sediment column. Again, there are known, and more importantly, there are unknown public health risks and contaminants known to cause mutations in the very listed species we are attempting to recover. However, study of

these particular elements and the effects on the fish population and human population have either been disregarded or ignored. The city is also privileged to have the Umatilla National Wildlife Refuge as a neighbor and a land-owner of the community. This brings with it a rather diverse wildlife community that the residents of this community cherish. However, in the attempt to recover listed salmonid species, other similarly treasured species will be put at risk. It would seem somewhat irresponsible to put all other species at risk for the ostensible benefit of a single species. These include the vibrant migratory water fowl populations, shore birds, including herons and egrets, upland game birds, and mammals such as deer, and others. These wildlife resources appear to be expendable in the continued push from those set on the removal of dams and the resulting destruction of current wildlife habitat which includes wetlands. When the negative impacts on economics, navigation, flood control, power generation, and recreational aspects with the removal of the John Day Dam are added to the negative and questionable ecological benefits, the removal of the John Day Dam would seem totally unthinkable from any rational viewpoint. To continue with the charade that has prevailed when there is so little understanding of the impacts of the majority of the salmon's life cycle, it would seem that any decision made is questionable at best and disastrous at worst. Issues such as ocean conditions, predation, harvest methods, and total take, adult return migration and others are barely understood if understood at all. Can improvements be made to aid in salmonid recovery? The answer is yes. Should those improvements be made? Again, the answer is yes. Is dam removal a viable option. The answer is an unequivocal no. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this very important issue."

(Clapping from audience).

Stuart Stanger: Thank you, I have a copy of that letter and your test results, so - yeah, thank you.

Judy Rea: My name is Judy Rea and I'm president of the Oregon Wheat Growers League. I would like to address the gentleman that is studying the transportation portion of the DREW. Is that right? Our recommendation is to be very careful of the cost as to replacing barge travel. A Terry Whiteside report rebuts the railroad claim of cost per unit train. The Wheat League contends that it will not be the cost, it will be what traffic will bear, and with wheat being at $3.10 a bushel, our cost of transportation to Portland today at 40 cents a bushel, that would more than double and at $3.10 there just won't be any wheat raised in the area or grains. Umatilla being the top wheat producer in the state and Morrow County being second wheat producer, those commodities will just no longer exist. Also, in Tennessee this month the National Association of Wheat Growers League voted resolution to stop the harvest of any endangered species.

Stuart stanger: Yeah -- thank you for your comment. No one on this team is involved with that Snake River study and the DREW team, but I'll make sure that comment gets to them. That's being done out of the Walla Walla District. The DREW that she mentioned is the Draw Down Regional Economic Work Group and they are heavily involved in the Snake River study. We do not have such a group, but we'll make sure that comment gets passed on to the Walla Walla District, so thank you. Other comments, questions?

Fred Ziari: Colonel, welcome to Umatilla County. Ladies and gentleman of the Corps and the NMFS, I welcome you to Umatilla County. My name is Fred Ziari. I'm here on behalf of Eastern Oregon Irrigation Association which has irrigated about 200,000 acres of irrigated agriculture in Eastern Oregon, mainly in Umatilla and Morrow County. I'm also an irrigation engineer involved in design of larger scale pumping stations, river stations, so I know those things very much in depth and detail. I just want to say something. As the old saying goes, that this is not your father's Oldsmobile. John Day Dam is not your Snake River dam or like any others. Tremendous as -- Gary Neal talked about $1.6 billion of the food product goes out of this area. The majority of it goes as an export to the rest of the world. It's a huge, huge food production machine in this area, and we -- I won't even ask a raise of hands how many people here think dam removal is a dumb idea. Maybe I should. (Laughter) But, our population of the world is going to double in 20 years, somewhere around 10 to 12 billion people, and we need to balance our fish restoration effort with food production effort. There's no question those things are in conflict. Especially Eric with NMFS, with the fish people, that are more involved in the fishery aspect of it, and we appreciate that. We appreciate their effort, but we need to have a good understanding what we do is very very worthwhile. We have 50,000 people a day die of starvation -- a day -- die of starvation, and we are putting $1.62 billion worth of food product in jeopardy. We had this discussion with Stuart and his team in detail this past month or so, and we raised the issue, and I'm glad they mentioned, even the discussion of these things put our community in risk. We also are a community, probably the only community that have had meaningful fish recovery. Our farming community got together with the tribe and the federal agencies and we worked together and we brought salmon back, and those kinds of programs are what you and us need to do together rather than doing all this wild ass ideas that are not going to produce any result. You know it and we know it. And, now I get back to the question and I hope Colonel, you make, you and the General, and maybe some people sit down with our farming communities in Oregon and Washington, and have a meaningful dialogue about fish and salmon recovery and I hope you have the invitation of NMFS. We have proposed, and I hope my friend, Darryll Olsen here mentioned it. We have proposed meaningful salmon recovery in the John Day pool, and we have presented that to the National Marine Fisheries Service, and we are not getting anywhere, but those are meaningful salmon recovery in the John Day pool, and in other areas, and we are capable of doing that. Let me encourage you to take that aspect of our request seriously. Now, I have several

technical questions. Stuart mentioned about the two canals or three rivers. The two-canal concept was our company -- my company -- did this study and we came up with the concept of recovering, of helping in recovery by proposing putting the canal on the Oregon and Washington side. That, however, should not be part of your consideration on the John Day provided that only is valid if you do not touch McNary pool. But, since McNary pool is also under consideration of studies and further drawdown scenarios as was proposed about a month ago we read, I propose that that should not --that canal system on both sides should be scrapped because that's not a very reliable source of water if McNary pool is going to be in any kind of further consideration for drawdown. That would not work. The second thing is, we propose that the study as part of our effort -- the farming community in Oregon and Washington, the utility companies, and we funded it ourselves, and we have done it in a so-called farmers' budget, not the federal government's' budget, so I would put a multiplier of three or four because that's what needs to be involved, and I'm serious about that. I have mentioned to Stuart that we have done, in 1994, I believe, we have hired a team of biologists to do a biological impact of draw down on the Umatilla Wildlife Refuge. I believe we provided that study to the Corps but neither they or I have a copy of it, but I look over -- I don't know if Darryll has a copy of it, and we will try to give that to you as part of your consideration. You have mentioned about 2000 wells. As far as I know there has never been any studies of the impact of -- because they are hydraulically connected to the Columbia River they are -- they need to be -- I don't think you're gonna have a time to study, because it has never been studied before, so I don't know how you're gonna handle it. That's lots and lots of wells. For the last 10 years everybody talked about John Day pool; let's bring it to minimum pool; that's what NMFS wanted; that's what the fish managers wanted; minimum pool, which is lowering of only 7 feet instead of over 100 feet of drawdown that they're talking about. And under 7 feet drawdown -- you know -- we have done this study which showed that over 95% of all of the pumping stations in Oregon would be totally disabled. Now, that being said, and I'm very familiar with it, I have no idea how you guys gonna come up with a solution putting a pumping station there, because if the canal is out, you need to buy the farms and basically what you have -- came to the same conclusion in the Snake River -- that the best pie out is the buy-out of the farm -- that's probably sad to say -- that's the conclusion you're gonna come up with, because I don't know how you're gonna handle the sedimentation problem in the John Day pool, because that's very very serious. And also, I was gonna mention that for the last 10 years everybody talks about John Day pool lowering 7 feet to minimum pool. As far as I know -- I was gonna ask the gentleman from NMFS, that is still in your Biological Opinion, isn't that true? The minimum pool.

Eric Ostrovsky: Within '95 (not audible).

Fred Ziari: Correct. And that is your Biological Opinion that you base your recovery plan. Correct?

Eric Ostrovsky: Yes -- Biological Opinion, but it has been superseded. The Corps and NMFS have looked at that. We no longer agree that should be done. One of the things in the Biological Opinion, that's the '95 opinion ... it was realized that when that Opinion occurred there were a lot of things going on in a very complex system, and that things could change, and that's one of the reasons why there has been a lot of collaborative work between agencies, fish and wildlife managers, etc., so, you know, that it has changed over time is not that surprising, that they no longer would be looking at it.

Fred Ziari: But, it's still in the plan?

Eric Ostrovsky: NMFS -- there has been an agreement; they're not looking at----

Fred Ziari: Have you let the public hear -- know that you're not looking at that? As far as I know, I never got a letter that says you are not looking at that. But, that's not part of the plan. Well then, trying to get at whatever it is in the Biological Opinion, we are really -- that doesn't mean that's the right thing to do, because for the last 10 years we have fought endlessly to say that bringing it to minimum operating pool doesn't mean anything, and I'm glad you agree with us. The other aspect that is really bothersome to us, causing us grave concern, is the attitude of National Marine Fisheries Service toward irrigated agriculture. As I said, this is the most important thing that a human being can have, availability of food, and here's what NMFS says in the Biological Opinion that the title of it is -- this is in Chapter 5 of Many Stream Passage. The Corps -- you are directing it to the Corps of Engineers -- the Corps and the state water resource agencies -- now we are getting into the state water policies -- the Corps and the state water resource agencies should not allow new water withdrawal permits that result in a net loss of flows and should review existing water withdrawals that reduce systems' ability to meet flow objectives. That is what is concerning our community, Colonel. That not only deny everything; it doesn't matter if the city -- of my friend George Hash -- they have a prison being put here. They need water for prisoners and you are denying water to the prisoners which may not be a bad idea (laughter), but I didn't know … (omission here when starting new tape) … really, really difficult in our communities and I hope you heard our communities' voice and you take that into consideration. I don't think, Stuart, with all due respect to you, in Juneau, Alaska, I believe there were 10 people attended.

Stuart Stanger: Yeah, about 10 or 12.

Fred Ziari: You did not have five mayors, four or five city managers, a county judge, and whole communities attending and saying, "Hell, no." This is not the same thing, and I hope you have considered that seriously. Thank you very much.

(Clapping)

Stuart Stanger: Yeah, thank you, Fred. We have worked with Fred on a lot of things, and all I can say is, I don't think I heard Fred say anything that was incorrect, so, he's absolutely right, there are huge impacts to this area with a drawdown, so thanks, Fred.

Darryll Olsen: My name is Darryll Olsen, a resource economist with the Pacific Northwest Project, located in the Tri-Cities. I am here tonight representing the Eastern Oregon Irrigators' Association and the Columbia-Snake River Irrigators Association. I have two questions and a couple of statements I would like to make. I think the questions can be answered tonight. The first question is directed to you, Stuart, and that is -- I would like to hear what is the criteria that the Corps is gonna use to move from Phase I to Phase II. What criteria are you going to use to make a recommendation to Congress about whether or not you should proceed to Phase II, which would be more extensive studies of the John Day pool drawdown?

Stuart Stanger: Let me try to answer that. I get asked that every meeting we have, and I don't have the exact answer. We're hoping that either a black or white answer will become apparent as we proceed through Phase I, and let me give you an example of what a black and white answer might be. Through the PATH process and through this Planning Aid Team that we're forming, they may tell me that there is a 25% probability that salmon recovery would occur if we draw down John Day Dam, 25% probability, and we may say that there is a $3 billion cost associated with that, and I personally would say that's not very good odds. I would not recommend further study. On the other hand, they may say there's a 90% probability that we could have salmon recovery and the cost might be $500 million, then I'd be more inclined to buy that. What I'm afraid of is that we will come out in the middle somewhere, and then fortunately these guys wearing uniforms in Washington, D.C. will have to make that decision. I can see a gray answer, if you will, a recommendation where the Corps says we think this is what the cost will be and we're real comfortable with these cost estimates, but there is still uncertainty about what the biological benefit would be, and therefore, to Congress we may recommend that we do some more biological studies, but nothing else at this time. That would kinda be a gray response. We're hopeful that a black or white answer will come out, but I don't know that at this time. Does that help answer?

Darryll Olsen: So, at this time you don't have any criteria to make that decision.

Stuart Stanger: No, I can't say that we've gotta have 50% probability and a billion dollar cost; we haven't established any criteria like that. No.

Darryll Olsen: A second question is directed to Eric, National Marine Fisheries Service. You have indicated that you're gonna rely heavily on the PATH process for biological benefits and much of the criteria, much of the decision-making on this, is gonna depend on biological benefits. The PATH process has not led to a smooth even consensus of scientific opinion. It has led to a very contentious situation and there are major groups from the University of Washington and from others, I think even including some of your Mon … people that are disagreeing with the PATH results or are unsatisfied with those results. How are you gonna be able to provide viable credible information on biological benefits if you are relying on a highly contentious process that is losing credibility rapidly in the region?

Eric Ostrovsky: Well, first of all, the PATH process was provided through the Corps on how they're going to conduct this study and go through the stages, and Bob, I think, could give you a better idea of the information that we're gonna be looking at, the biological information that the Corps is going to be looking at in Phase I of the study, but it's more than just the PATH process and it's a number of studies that have already been going on. There is some new information that they're gonna look at out there, too, so, you know, I would feel more comfortable if the Corps sort of gives you a list of everything in the Phase I study because they're the ones who will actually be conducting that.

Stuart Stanger: Yeah, the Corps is the one actually doing the biological studies, and we are going to use this PATH team. If there is one area of concern about my schedule, it is the PATH process. That's one of the reasons we are implementing this Planning Aid Team, and we are using other modeling techniques, and Bob could get into those if you want those details, maybe after the meeting. When we break up you can get the specifics on that, but we're going to use more than PATH. We are hoping that PATH comes through, and when I say PATH, there is a group. We're hoping they come through and comply with our schedule. If they don't, I will have to deal with that in September, whether or not we end up slipping the decision, or a recommendation to Congress, I guess it would depend on how long they told us they were going to take, but right now, we think we have them on board. I agree with you, it's still very contentious; we're hoping that some of that is resolved before we have to use the information, but I can't guarantee that. We may have to deal with that in September.

Darryll Olsen: Okay. So you're well aware of the problems with PATH.

Stuart Stanger: Yeah, while I'm not personally that involved with it. I count on this guy. There's too much to keep track of. I know you guys can't keep track of it, cause I can't and I work with it every day, so there is a lot of information -- I don't know the specifics but I know there's problems.

Darryll Olsen: Your study is going to depend heavily on the assurance and the credibility of your biological benefits, otherwise, it's gonna fall apart very quickly.

Stuart Stanger: Yeah, absolutely, recognized. Let me just add one more thing -- we know this study is not going to have all the information. We know that in the … studies we know that habitat studies … we know that more detailed economic studies … a lot of studies would have to be done before you would ever make a decision to draw down. That's what this Phase II and $20 million would be all about. All we're trying to do is get enough information to see if there is this black and white answer; whether or not drawdown should be considered any further, so I guess, in response I would say that if PATH tells me that there is a 40% probability, but there might be a 5% error, I might be able to live with that for the decision I'm making at this time. I might want better information before I decided to draw down, but it might be good enough for what we're trying to do in Phase I. Okay?

Darryll Olsen: A couple of statement observations. The Eastern Oregon Irrigators' Association and the Columbia/Snake River Irrigators Association did not support this Phase I activity, and they did that because they felt that there was ample technical information available. They did not spend $3 million, but they spent $3,000 to have one of your former Corps employees put together a technical study that showed the costs of the drawdown of John Day would be about $400 million a year, annually. I suspect you're gonna end up with a number that looks very similar to that, $3 million later. The Associations do not support Phase II activity, either. I would like to ask the question of Ed Woodruff, who is a veteran in this -- Ed, how many drawdown studies have we done, major configuration studies in this region? Since 1991? Even 1990; I'll give you a year. That's okay. How many have we done?

Ed Woodruff: How many studies?

Darryll Olsen: How many studies?

Ed Woodruff: Well, I think you would probably go back to the System Operation Review which started looking at this issue in -- and we'd go on to the Snake River studies -- there is a Phase I and then the feasibility study, and now this one.

Darryll Olsen: In case you're counting, this study makes it the sixth major study, either drawdown EIS configuration study -- this has been conducted by the Corps in roughly the last 10 years. The Corps cannot maintain credibility -- National Marine Fisheries Service cannot maintain credibility by coming out repeatedly with these major studies, and redoing them, and redoing them, and asking these major impact questions. These are highly disruptive alternatives that you're bringing forward. This is not resource management. Coming forward with these major drawdown studies with major disruptions, $400 million of your impact for benefits that may be $10 to $20 million if you were extremely lucky. These are not resource management actions. I don't know what they are, but these are no longer resource management studies. With the fear that the Corps might be contemplating a 7th or an 8th study on drawdowns, the water resource users from three of the states -- Washington, Oregon and Idaho -- are formally requesting tonight, and Colonel, you will receive a written request later in the week in Pasco -- are formally requesting that the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Corps of Engineers evaluate a new water resource management alternative that was brought forward by work that was conducted by Pacific Northwest Project, University of Washington and Harza Engineering. This is not a drawdown study. This is a study that would restructure the use of the water that is being used now, and it would turn to the tributaries and ask questions about what can we do with new water storage projects; what can we do with water marketing and transfers; what can we do with water efficiency to provide measurable fish benefits -- something we're very skeptical we will see come out of this John Day pool study. That ends my comments.
Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

(Clapping)

Ron Baker: I'm Ron Baker of C&B Livestock. We had the opportunity in 1973 to put a project on the John Day pool just west of Umatilla and at that time I had a chance to work very closely with the Corps of Engineers and came to believe they were a very objective and very cooperative group and did an outstanding job of managing the dams on the river. And over the years we've had certain little problems on levels of the John Day pool and we have found the Corps of Engineers very responsive to our needs and very helpful. I guess the thing that disturbs me most tonight is to come and say -- is this the same Corps of Engineers that I have been working with over the years? And I realize you do nothing except what Congress mandates you to do, but I'm hopeful that you will remain and maintain the same objectivity in these studies that you have maintained in operating the dams on the river very very well. As you notice, you find that everybody here is very much in one opinion. They do not want a drawdown of the John Day pool, because to us that have been involved here, as I have been involved since 1973 in making the desert bloom, of bringing the water resource from the John Day pool onto our lands and the number of acres that have been stated, and the amount of food that is produced is astronomical,

but the thing that perhaps is very important in your study is to realize that you have the biological aspects of the salmon recovery, and we're very much supportive of doing everything we can within reason to recover the salmon. The thing that is very important for you to realize that I have a banker to set down to and I do not determine agricultural prices and, therefore, when you talk about that you're going to change the pumping plants on the John Day pool to accommodate the drawdown, you'd just as well save your time in designing those plants, because I can tell you from an operational standpoint that I cannot afford to pay at least the other $50 an acre that it will cost to pay the additional electricity to pump that water that additional distance, and I say that because I designed -- when I put in my system in 1973 -- we designed a system to go clear to the edge of the original river channel, and we had to abandon it in 1973 because it was not cost effective. How can you imagine -- at that time electricity only cost $30 an acre. Today it costs an average of $100 an acre. The margins that we operate on are very very narrow; in fact, illusive this last year in agriculture. Most of us actually went behind this last year because of depressed agricultural prices, and yet the thing that makes us get in there, and get up every morning, and keep producing this food is not only the sense of fulfillment, but we know that this population is going to continue to grow and we do not like to see that there are starving people throughout the world that we are helping to provide a food supply. Nobody talks about that. Everybody is talking about surviving the salmon. They are very important, but how important are they when we compare also the food that we are supplying to a hungry world, and so to us that are sitting here and realizing the very serious nature of the very narrow margins that we're working on, and then you come and propose a major change in our economy that we know, in operating day to day, we cannot sustain, and it is so obvious to us, that's why we can say, hey, you're wasting your time if you believe human life is important. It is so obvious because if you want to do this, then don't worry about designing the pumping plants, just start buying out all the farmland, start buying out the plants, the food processing plants that are dependent on that farmland, and find someplace else for the workers to be employed. Because, that's what you're talking about. It is very very obvious to us. We hope that in your coming here that you can get some sense of that's why people are so opposed, because it seems ludicrous to us, so hopefully, in your study, you will maintain, as I say, the objectivity to what is really important, and #1 is the saving and the furnishing of human life; #2 is to recover the salmon, in that order. So please, we hope that you will remain the objective good managers of the Columbia River system that we have always found you to be, and you will remain very objective in your study. Thank you.

(Clapping)

Stuart Stanger: Let me just thank you for your comments and I can assure you that at least this team will be objective, and you are absolutely right -- we know that the pumping costs would increase tremendously, the cost to put new pump stations in would be very high, the cost to

dredge canals would be extremely high, and as Fred mentioned, if McNary's not there, they won't work. So, we understand all that. Buyout is one option that will be considered along with that, and we will look at the cost of those, but again, a buyout doesn't produce any food, and we agree. So, thank you for your comments.

Dick Farley: Hello, my name is Dick Farley and I'm a retired Navy man and I have listened to a lot of complaints when I was in the service, and all that, and everybody that has got up and talked here, still hasn't hit the basic problem to this situation, and that is, in 1920 there were 16 million fish come up, and in 1920 to 1928 there were 55 canneries on the river, and from that 16 million fish, in 1928, they were depleted by 90%, and that was before Bonneville Dam was even built, and they built that in 1936. In 1928 there were 7 million fish coming up. The Indians and the other people, commercials, was netting 4 million out of the 7 million, and today, I think it's about 3 million coming up and they are still netting 2 million of them. They've never had a chance to recover. Nobody has got enough gumption in the government to say no to the netting out in the ocean, the netting by the Indians in the river -- you've got to have a leader and I haven't seen one yet. (Clapping) and the definition of a leader, when I was in the service, was a person that made a quick, snappy decision and took the full responsibilities for his actions. Now, I've made that situation a lot of times, and I've gotten in hot water over it also, but I'm still here. Now, a few years ago I was getting some pamphlets from Northwest Power Planning Council. A few years back they had a five-year study on Walleye, because they were depleting the salmon and the steelhead. Well, they found out it wasn't the Walleye, so then I met a gentleman from DEQ above the dam here about five years ago, and I asked, what are they going to blame it on now. He says, well, they're thinking about blaming it on the Shad, and I looked at him and thought you've got to be kidding me. Shad eat microscopic things, and then they found out that it was a squawfish. Okay, from there, on the Snake River, years ago, I heard that the people that own the three dams, Hell's Canyon, Oxbow, and Brownlee -- they were told by the government to put a fish bypass on it, or get fined. Well, they took the lesser; they got fined. One time payment and that was it, and we still don't have any fish going up past them -- they stop at Hell's Canyon. And then, another thing, the Indians were complaining about us barging and truckin' all the fish down below Bonneville. All kinds of articles in the papers, so what do they do -- they build a deal there on the Umatilla River, and I called up there about three months ago one time and asked the gal -- I says how do they get em to where they're going. Oh, we truck 'em, but yet they were complaining about us truckin' them down below Bonneville, and if we are talkin' stopping the harvesting in the ocean and in the river, there would be no cost to the government, no cost to us. If you just had a leader, and that's all you need, somebody with enough guts. That's it.

(Clapping).

Ty Hansell: My name is Ty Hansell. I have just a couple of questions that I don't know the answers to -- one of them is, how come our state agencies aren't involved in this process and if they are, where are they?
Stuart Stanger: They are involved. They are part of that Planning Aid Team, both Oregon and Washington.

Ty Hansell: Well, what I'm curious about -- why aren't they at the public hearings. Why isn't the Department of Agriculture, the Water Resource Department, Fish and Game. I mean, to me the State of Oregon is responsible for the waters in the State of Oregon and we should have some responsibility. The federal government, I didn't know, could have water. They build impoundment facilities and stuff, but I didn't know that the federal government actually had water rights and owned water that the states would control.

Stuart Stanger: Yeah, I have no idea why they don't show up. They are invited.

Ty Hansell: The other question -- I've got a couple of them -- but another one that has been really bothering me, and I have sat through -- not as much as you guys, obviously, have, but we've heard many many -- I'm on the water resource commission for the state and we've heard many many reports. I still question, how do you harvest an endangered species? An incidental take still bothers me. I mean, I really struggle with it. We don't shoot Bengal tigers and we don't do this, and if something is really endangered and we really want a recovery, how do we harvest? On any level. I mean, that to me is a problem that I've never been able to #1 - find an answer, and #2 - I don't think there is one. Another one that is a real problem to me in this state is the impact without barging on our road systems. The carbon monoxide and all the gases that were related to earlier, but our roads, I don't know how many of you had to come up from Portland all the way up the gorge there; they're in terrible shape, and we're gonna put -- I'm just gonna draw a figure -- somebody said 580,000 more trucks. We think Portland is a nightmare, Rufus is going to be an absolute disaster. Another one that I really struggle with, and this is a personal opinion, is that basically we're kinda the laughing stock of the world. We take a clean, renewable cheap resource to create electricity and we're gonna replace it by fossil fuel, wind or nuclear -- I mean -- anyplace in the world would be looking at us like, god, we got this, and all of our development, like Ron Baker said, was all done on the cheap electricity -- to go out in the desert and our ranch does it -- we don't take out of the Columbia, we take out of wells, but I'm sure they're gonna be considered hydraulically connected before we're done, but anyway, it bothers me that we're gonna raise those prices and we won't be here, and even if you enlarge those to the stream flow, they won't be here, and Fred Ziari, my good friend, I have to disagree with him on one thing. I feel that we are very rich in our way of life. It may not be monetary but our way of life here is very rich, and I take it as a personal affront that our chosen way of life -- my chosen profession --

how I want to raise my children will drastically be impacted by a group of people, or people sitting in Washington, D.C. I think we have a guilt trip of what happened to the Indian tribes. I think, 100 years from now we're gonna have a guilt trip of what happened to the people in this Columbia Basin, if we really don't start paying attention. You built the dams, you flooded the towns, you moved the towns, and now you're gonna draw it back down. It just -- to me its ludicrous. but I guess we gotta look at it. Thank you.

(Clapping)

Stuart Stanger: Comments?

Craig Reeder: Yeah. I work for Ron Offitt down in Boardman. Ron runs companies that -- we made a large commitment here-- the last year in the hopes that common sense would prevail in this issue and that we would be able to make a longterm play here, and continue to farm. I've debated on whether or not I should get up and say anything to be redundant. I mean there are a lot of issues here that are emotional, but I think -- I think the one things we have to focus in on here is tangibility, and in Eric's presentation he has noted several survival improvements that have been implemented over the last few years or months, or whatever, and have you seen any tangible benefits from those?

Eric Ostrovsky: Yeah -- the science for one -- for spring and summer Chinook salmon has -- for the smolts between the project, the survival rate has gone up. There have been what we call smolt adult returns, which hasn't necessarily recovered. It shows for that species, at least, in the main stem, some of those efforts have been helpful. It is also fall Chinook salmon in general have been returning at a higher rate, and I have a white paperback back there on it, from very low numbers, I think below 100 fish were back to about 1000 fish returning this year. Now, that's through a number of issues. Actually, harvest rates have reduced and, you know, there's also been what we're doing on the main stem, and perhaps ocean conditions. There are a lot of variables but at least some of those results have been somewhat successful.

Audience member: I trust the tangible numbers we put into the study because I heard a lot tonight in the presentation -- I heard a lot of "tends to," a lot of "could provide" and even when we analyze what our threshold is going to be for how we analyze this thing. You know, 45% chance -- you know, when you analyze a 45%, or even a 95% chance that we can increase the salmon. You know, I can tell you, part of my job responsibilities are to complete the budget, and it's not a chance that if we do not have water there that my budget will drastically change, and it's not a chance, or probably the people will lose jobs, and that this area and the world that we supply food to will be affected. It's not a chance. It's there, and it's real, and you know, if you go to

make your recommendation I strongly urge you that when you are weighing on one side, we've got an 80% chance, and here's the tangible cost, your chance versus cost, no matter what the percentage is, it is still as chance, and we know what's gonna happen here, and I don't mean to be redundant but, you know, I'm carrying on what five generations of family have carried on by being born and raised in this area, and being a productive member of the agricultural community, and, you know, if I can find a woman who will stay with me long enough to have some kids, you know. Me not having that chance to provide that legacy on -- I mean, words just can't describe how robbed I would feel with that, and again, chance versus what's real.

Eric Ostrovsky: I understand what you're saying. Economics is something that a study might show.

Audience member: My legacy is not economics, Eric. It's got nothing to do with economics.

Eric Ostrovsky: Well, with what's happening, you know, in the area --now on the biological point, the level of the bar, that's something that policy makers are gonna have to make a decision on, but when they see the impact to the community, and so forth, it's gonna start, you know, making people, I think, stop and consider -- say, you're saying, the chance you don't want, then how much biological certainty are you gonna need for any action. While Fred is here I just wanted to say one other thing, because he asked about John Day, and what happened to MOP and I do want to correct what I said before, that there were a lot of things going on, and I was thinking about what was happening with the studies that originally went on on the Snake dams. Well, I would say with MOP and John Day that that's really an operational decision; it's not a study that would have to go back to Congress for re-authorization, so that's something that the agencies would determine in a collaborative basis. What I said to you was wrong; I just wanted to correct that right now.

Rollin Engbretson: My name is Rollin. I'm a local farmer. You've fringed upon the fact that there will be a percentage of possible influence upon the salmon recovery that will help you make your decision upon, whether or not to forward this study you've got to the Congress. Has it ever entered your mind that there may be a percentage of disadvantage to report to the Congress on the adverse affect to the ecosystem that has been created over a 50-year period in the Columbia Basin, and also to the adverse affect? What percentage of adverse affect will it take for you to tell the Congress that this is ludicrous, that we go on with this study? What percentage is that gonna be? Is that gonna be a 90%; is that gonna be a 50%? I would like an answer if I could.

Stuart Stanger: I don't know what the percentage will be, but what I can tell you is that there will be negative impacts to fish and wildlife. We will take all of that into account. There will be a

huge impact to the Umatilla Wildlife Refuge. We know that even drawing the pool down to minimum operating pool, we couldn't keep water in the Umatilla Wildlife Refuge. Those are huge impacts. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will help us evaluate those in this Planning Aid Letter that I mentioned. They will tell us what those impacts will be. Those are all negatives to a drawdown. We also know that drawing down may not be good for the fish for a number of years. The sediment and the conditions for fish passage and the predators that are in there are now in a much more condensed pool. That all could have negative impacts on the fish species, for a number of years. That will all be taken into account.

Rollin Engbretson: The second question would be is -- who is willing to open this Pandora's Box to all the adverse effects that maybe will not be able to change once they have been exposed? And what -- who will be the responsible parties that are the ones responsible for making those decisions? Will they be our Congressmen -- I think we have 12 or 14 that are representative of our state that are not representative of the area, the remaining of those Senators and Congressmen. They are making decisions for a small area of this nation and elements of what is pertinent to what we do, and they have no influence nor maybe even knowledge of how that affects the ecosystem, and something that I revere as beautiful and very essential to our area, and why would we want to change something that we've already experienced a lot of that adversity and try to take it back to something that we have no answer to what it may reveal? Thank you.

Stuart Stanger: Yeah, good comments. It will be your U.S. Congressmen that will make that decision of what risk they are willing to buy.

(Audience Member) Why can't we make the recommendation not to go further with it so that we can keep this at a level where people that are involved and people that have pertinent knowledge of the area and the system that we're talking about, and keep it from those people that have no idea of what they're talking about?

Stuart Stanger: Well, that just not the way the process works. The way the process works is -- we are in Phase I, and that ..

Audience member: is a recommendation you will make as to whether or not?

Stuart Stanger: Yes, and that's why we are here. We know that you know more about the impacts than we do.

Audience member: Then it can be addressed here.

Stuart Stanger: It can be addressed here. We're here to listen to your comments. That's what we're here for, and your comments impact the recommendation that we will make to my Colonel, and then he will make to his General, and he will make to his General, and the Assistant Secretary of the Army, and ultimately it will end up in Congress.

Audience member: Providing it gets there. Then I won't be here.

Stuart Stanger: But this is the process that the federal government has for us involving the local communities. We come out and listen to you, and we do make recommendations and consider your input, but it will ultimately be the U.S. Congress. They do not have to agree with the recommendation that the Corps of Engineers sends forward.

Question not audible.

Stuart Stanger: Yeah, he made the comment he would get hold of one of the Senators; I won't mention the name, but that's a very wise thing to do

Carol Michael: I'm Carol Michael from Boardman and I would like to read a letter written by my husband who is a member of both the Boardman City Council and a Director of the Boardman Park and Recreation District. Some of this has been shared previously, but I would like to read it in its entirety. "I wish to share some serious concerns regarding your proposed study of drawdown options for the John Day pool. Of utmost importance for the City of Boardman is the possible impact on our municipal water supply. We draw our water supply from the Columbia River and any drastic change in water levels will severely impact our water quality and supply. Our city Public Works Department has on file the effects of our water quality and supply from your previous minor drawdowns. The results were not favorable: increased Coliform and pathogen counts and reduced supply volume in our municipal water system. Also, of great importance is the financial peril the City of Boardman will face if severe drawdowns are allowed to happen. The City is right in the middle of expanding our water supply and exercising our water permit. As a member of the City Council, I consider the possible waste of approximately $2 million expended on our water system expansion to be of grave consequence. Sixty-three percent of Boardman residents are low to moderate income, and we cannot recoup a $2 million loss by increasing water rates and/or taxes. I am sure you are very familiar with the Marina Park in Boardman. As a Park and Recreation District Director, I am really concerned on the impacts of drawdowns on basic park functions. Will our marina dock facilities be usable with a major drawdown? I think not. Also, the swimming area, which is the only recreational swimming area for our community will be a dry lake bed. I am at a loss as to why the Corps would help build the Fowler Road Native American access fishing site in the Boardman Marina Park at a cost of

millions of dollars, then lose the access to the river by drawing down the John Day pool. In the event of a drawdown, neither Native Americans or anyone else will be able to get a boat in or out of the Columbia River at the Boardman Marina. This is certainly not an example of good fiscal planning if you opt to lower the water level behind the John Day Dam. To put it succinctly, drawdowns, as suggested in your study options, would have such a major affect on this area that the cost of mitigation will be staggering. The concerns I have voiced here relate primarily to economics of the Columbia Basin area. Something else that has been lost in the media coverage of the Columbia River is the basic idea of flood control, which the dams provide for downstream cities. Please look back to the high water flooding problems during the winters of 1998 and 1997, and imagine the consequences without the dams' ability to manage water levels. I would hope in your decision-making process that you utilize competent scientific information and input from impacted area residents. Do not allow rhetoric from entities outside the region to drive the decision-making process as to continued further studies. Sincerely, Raymond D. Michael." Thank you.

Stuart Stanger: You're absolutely right. The City of Boardman's water supply would be significantly affected -- your Rainey well may not work at all. Your marina would be dry as all marinas on the existing John Day pool would be. New types of recreation may be provided. They would be fast-water recreation as opposed to slack-water recreation, but your comments are all very valid.

Terry Tallman: I am past mayor of the City of Boardman and now I am a Morrow County judge. I would just like to add a couple of things. I think that what Craig Reeder was trying to tell us tonight with some of the things that he was saying, of being a fifth generation person in the area. I think with the opening statement that the gentleman made from National Marine Fisheries says is that what makes the Northwest unique is the fish. I think that I would disagree with him. I think what makes the uniqueness of the Northwest is the people, and I think that's part of what Craig was trying to say -- that the people are what need to be considered before we consider the fish. I think also in looking at the drawdowns and the studies that were done on the Snake River, I went to some of the meetings when they considered those. I saw all of the different graphs and pictures and the representations and the information that was drawn from those studies, and what the scientists were trying to explain to us what those meant and I think the only logical conclusion that could have come from those studies was no one really knew. They spent all that money and they spent all that time and it wasn't that they were doing bad work, but there was no way that they could really tell what those things really meant, and if PATH and all this other stuff that you're gonna go through is what you're gonna try to use the same way to get to the conclusion, I don't see how you can come to any conclusion from what everybody else has said tonight is -- what we think and we can tell you right now -- it's just a bad idea, and it needs to be stopped, and

we will go to our Congressmen, and we already have, and we will go to our Senators, you know, and they've already made the statement -- our Senators have already said that they're gonna be there on those dams and they're gonna try to stop it, and we're gonna support that.

Stuart Stanger: Thank you. Other comments, questions?

Lou Lyons: I'm with Elmer's Irrigation. Here a couple of weeks ago you sent in a group of people from the College of Idaho to do a study, University of Idaho, and you would select little communities like Umatilla, Stanfield, and Adams, Oregon, and you had them do in four hours what would happen to Umatilla or the area if they breach the dams on the Snake, and you are paying these people to go out and do these things. We spent our time there going through their process and saying, okay to do this, "don't do anything to dams." If we do Phase II or Phase III, and it was just like -- here we are again, you know, you come down here and say, oh yeah, if we do this you're going to bring economic development to this community, you're going to do this and that, and now you're coming in the back door a couple of weeks later, saying, hey, we're going to take down the John Day pool, you know, -- so what is the deal? When is the money wheel going to stop? That you're putting out for all these studies, you know, our tax money is paying for all this, you know, and our community, so on one hand you're over here sending these people down here, saying yeah, we're going to do this, if this happens up there on the Snake, but yet you come in here today and you're presenting taking the pool down. What is the real story? What is the real story about what's going on here?

Stuart Stanger: We're not proposing to do anything to the John Day Dam. I hope no one left here -- leaves here tonight with the impression that we're proposing to do anything to the John Day Dam. We are trying to determine whether or not there are enough benefits to consider drawdown. There are an entire mix of things we could do at John Day Dam to improve salmon recovery, but we are not proposing to do anything at John Day Dam. With the Snake River study, I'm not involved with that at all, or the University of Idaho's studies, but they are in an entirely different phase. They are much further along. They are years ahead of where we are at John Day. They've already made the decision on the Snake River projects that drawdown is something that should be considered. They have not made a decision that drawdown should occur, but they've already made the decision years ago that we're trying to make, and that is drawdown should be an alternative they consider on the Snake. We don't know that at John Day, so we're in two entirely different phases. I don't know if that helps answer your pro ---

Lou Lyons: No, because it's the whole program. It's a regional -- like we try to talk regional, but no, they only let the Umatilla people talk. We talk in regional as far as how Hermiston is going to be affected; how Boardman is going to be affected; how everything -- this thing from the

Snake River, from -- you start way up the Snake, all the way down to Portland. It's going to affect somebody. It's not just pieces; it's not a puzzle, of how you put it together. It's the whole program.

Stuart Stanger: Well, I agree.

Lou Lyons: If you -- we'll do this here, we'll do this here -- it's just like when they came down. Says, well, if you do that up here, you guys are going to have a little barge traffic, and have all this, gonna have all this, we're going to do this here, and now you come in here. We won't have that. So, you say, I really don't know about that part up there, because I wasn't part of it, but the Corps of Engineers is part of the whole program, so do we buy that?

Stuart Stanger: I'm not trying to convince you of anything.

Lou Lyons: I know that, but the question is -- is what are you trying to sell us?

Stuart Stanger: I'm not trying to sell you anything. I'm telling you that we are studying ---

Lou Lyons: But the fact is, you're still going down that road.

Stuart Stanger: I'm not going down any road. What I told you tonight is that I was not here to convince you of anything. We're here to hear your comments, and I've heard your comments.

Lou Lyons: Right.

Stuart Stanger: But I'm not trying to convince you of anything, nor am I proposing to do anything to the John Day Dam.

Lou Lyons: Well, the John Day Dam where you say you would lower the level or removal of it, that issue is lowering the level.

Stuart Stanger: I'm not proposing to lower the level or change the operation of John Day Dam at all. I have no authority to do that.

Lou Lyons: No, I never said you did, but my point was -- is everybody sliding through the door and we were shown here a couple of weeks ago. Fred was there and a few other people were there, and now you're sliding in the door again, with another program. So, you know, do we all just sit here and go uh huh, uh huh, you know. What is the real story?

Berle Cooley: My name is Berle Cooley. I recently retired from the federal government. I spent about 25 years with the Corps of Engineers working at McNary Dam. I had the opportunity to become quite familiar with some of the barging operations. I noticed that hasn't been discussed much here tonight. From what I could observe over the development of the barging system, it is quite successful in downstream fingerling passage. Also, I know that there are many new developments in upstream adult passage that have not been done on any of the Columbia River dams. Some of the public power dams in Washington have incorporated newer designs of adult fish passage. None of the dams on the Columbia system have changed their fish ladders since all of the dams were installed years ago. I feel that our money is better spent -- rather than doing studies on how to change the system that would affect all of our region so drastically, our money would be much better spent to do more studies on successful barging to get the fingerlings down the river and also on more successful methods of adult travel back up the river. We need to look into new methods and new designs to accomplish that. Many of these are already in and as some of the gentlemen talked about, there are fish friendly turbines coming. There are many tests that have been done on fish passage. They probably will be able to travel through the turbines some day, but our money needs to be spent on developing the fish passage, developing the habitat, the spawning habitat, getting -- cutting the harvest down, all the methods that we can do that will not damage the economy or the lifestyle that we are used to here in the Northwest. Thank you.

Stuart Stanger: Thank you.

Art Kegler: Howdy. My name is Art Kegler. I'm just a small business man in the area and I have a couple of comments. I'd like to, first of all, state that I certainly respect all of the statistics presented by the learned officials that have presented them, and I hope you will take them in dire consideration. Secondly, I'd like to compliment the gentleman from C&D Livestock when he said he has to sit down with his banker. He's very fortunate -- I have to sit down with my bankers, so I'd just like to make a couple of comments, and I'd like to enter into the conversation logic. That's a strange word in this scenario, but from two newspaper articles that ran in January and early February here in this area, one in the East Oregonian and one in the Tri-Cities Herald. The first headline said, "Columbia Smelt Runs Down to a Trickle." Columbia River runs of smelt, a small fish, once caught by the millions are down to a trickle after seven years of declines. And could you believe it -- smelt do not cross any dams. Maybe, just maybe, there is something else involved. An additional article -- got to flip a page here -- put on the glasses -- additional article, "Predators Taking Toll on Endangered Salmon." "Flocks of predatory birds including two colonies of Caspian terns near Boardman are devouring as much as a third of the endangered juvenile salmon smolts that migrate through the Columbia River" I'm skipping through this article "rising populations of seals, sea lions and predatory birds are also taking a toll on Oregon's coastal salmon and may be undermining recovery efforts under the Oregon Plan for salmon and

watersheds. When combined with predation by seals and sea lions, the total loss attributed to predation may exceed 45% of the migratory salmon in the Columbia according to a joint study by the Oregon State University and the Columbia River Inter-tribal Fish Commission." I ask you, with your study do you feel that you can affect 45% of the salmon recovery program? Do you think you can actually, by affecting the removal, drawdown or studying the dams, that you can improve the salmon program by 45%? Addressing the predators, and I ask you these questions -- ever thought of removing artificial man-made dredging islands instead of dams? That's where the terns and the -- the Caspian terns and others reside. Ever thought of doing a controlled harvest of excess seals and sea lions. They affect 45% of the salmon. Can you do that?

Stuart Stanger: No.

Art Kegler: Maybe you should redirect your efforts.

Stuart Stanger: I don't have that option, but I don't believe drawing down the dams would produce that kind of an effect, and if you look at the maps that we have back here, and you could get somebody to explain them -- there would actually be additional islands created with the drawdown, so you need to be aware of that, as well.

Art Kegler: That would only add to the predators availability to survive by providing additional islands for the terns, etc?

Stuart Stanger: I can't say that for sure but that's the potential. There is land instead of water -- yes.

Art Kegler: I refer to my statement logic.

Bob Willis: I just want to answer, or address a question that you talked about regarding the Caspian tern colony. We paid for the study that was done by Oregon State and Columbia River Inter-tribal Fish Commission, to take a look at the tern issue. That was in response to a Biological Opinion requirement, but what we have done is been able to pull together the facts to make a decision on whether some action should occur. We are doing an action right now, hopefully that will reduce predation on juvenile salmon out there. The purpose of what we're doing right here is also in response to a Biological Opinion recommendation. What we're trying to do is pull together the facts, the science, to say is there a benefit, and then compare that against the cost. So, you know, that's how we are proceeding ahead in terms of trying to figure out the right things to do. Thanks.

Stuart Stanger: Thanks, Bob. Well, are we all exhausted? I appreciate your comments. Again, my technical staff here -- they'll be available afterwards if you want to capture any of them. With that I'm going to turn the meeting back over to the Colonel.

Col. Robert Slusar: Again, I want to thank you for spending this time with us out of your busy schedules. As you know, this issue is very contentious; it's very confusing to me. As an Army officer I normally get a mission and it's not contradictory. Hopefully, it's not. Unfortunately, the missions I have are contradictory. I'm moving forward in all my projects on the Columbia River to increase the smolts moving down faster and the adults coming up quicker, as well, so we're spending those dollars that you talked about before to ensure that the passage at our projects are the best that they can be, by putting in improved turbine blades, outfalls, flow deflectors --those things, and those are ongoing, but I'm also getting a mission that says, study drawdown, and so, as a good Army officer I salute and I'm going to do the best job I can with the group that I have to ensure that I provide Congress with the information that they're looking for, and that's what we're here for tonight, and I do appreciate your comments. They will be heard. I hear them loud and clear, every place I go, and we will take all that into consideration, and I will provide a fair, equitable answer back to Congress as they have asked me to do, and those comments that you have provided today will be in that report, so if you want to join the team that's going to review that and help put that together so that we can review that and make that recommendation, please join our team, and again, thank you very much for being here tonight.

(Clapping).